United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

										
Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge		Milton I	. Shadur	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge						
CASE NUMBER		04 C	5922	DATE	E 11/30/2004					
CASE TITLE			Directv Inc. vs. William Woodlock							
MO	[In the following box (a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly the nature of the motion being presented.]									
DOCKET ENTRY:										
(1)	☐ Filed	Filed motion of [use listing in "Motion" box above.]								
(2)	□ Brief	Brief in support of motion due								
(3)	☐ Answ	Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due								
(4)	□ Rulin	Ruling/Hearing on set for at								
(5)	□ Status	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(6)	☐ Pretri	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(7)	☐ Trial[Trial[set for/re-set for] on at								
(8)	☐ [Bend	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at								
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] □ FRCP4(m) □ Local Rule 41.1 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FRCP41(a)(2).								
[Other docket entry] Enter Memorandum Opinion and Order. Woodlock's entire responsive pleading is stricken, with leave being granted to him to file a proper Amended Answer in this Court's chambers on or before December 13, 2004.										
(11)		further detail see orde	r attached to the orig	ginal minute order.]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Document				
 I	No notices required, a No notices required.	advised in open court.				Document Number				
	Notices mailed by jud	dge's staff.			number of notices					
	Notified counsel by t	elephone.	DEC 02 2004							
Docketing to mail notices.				G:MA	/					
Mail AO 450 form. Copy to judge/magistrate judge.			ryggo Lapil	si ars :n	docketing deputy initials	/				
Copy to Jungermagistrate Junge.				12/1/2004 date mailed notice						
SN		courtroom deputy's initials	ca:11195 1-	- 기골면 408.6 -	sn					
				e received in Clerk's Office	mailing deputy initials	<u> </u>				

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

DO	CK	E	TED
ner	. v	2	2004

DIRECTV	INC.,	Plaintiff,)))					DEC 0	
٧.)	No.	04	C 5	922		
WILLIAM	WOODLOCK,)))						
		Defendant.)						

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

William Woodlock ("Woodlock") has just submitted what he labels as his Answer, including no fewer than 22 purported affirmative defenses ("ADs"), to the lawsuit brought against him by DirecTV, Inc. ("DirecTV") charging him with satellite piracy. Even though pro se pleadings must be examined through a comparatively undemanding lens (Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972) (per curiam)), Woodlock's self-prepared pleading is defective in every paragraph--and more reasonable adherence to the established principles of pleading practice, even on the part of a pro se litigant, must be insisted upon. Accordingly Woodlock's entire responsive pleading is stricken, with leave however being granted to him to file a proper Amended Answer in this Court's chambers (with a copy of course being contemporaneously transmitted to DirecTV's counsel) on or before December 13, 2004 -- the day before the next scheduled status hearing in this action.

As a partial guide to Woodlock for that purpose, his

attention is directed to Appendices 1 and 5 to this Court's opinion in State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Riley, 199 F.R.D. 276, 278 (N.D. Ill. 2001). It seems highly doubtful that, given the objective good faith that is demanded of every litigant (as well as every lawyer) by Fed. R. Civ. P. ("Rule") 11(b), Woodlock can assert the types of blanket disclaimers and outright denials, or the blunderbuss ADs, that are contained in his present pleading. And he should understand the risks that are entailed by the absence of objective good faith in those respects.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Unlow D Studen

Date: November 30, 2004